




Serial No.: 09/833,119
Examiner: Fred O Ferris, III

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Cory D. Hess **Docket:** 135809
Serial No.: 09/833,119 **Art Unit:** 2128
Filed: April 11, 2001 **Examiner:** Fred O. Ferris, III
Title: Optical Route Design System and Method for Analyzing the Performance of an Optical Fiber Transmission Path

Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance

Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



Dear Sir:

In response to the Notice of Allowability, the following comments are made to the Reasons for Allowance.

*OK TO ENTER
FOR
Considered but
not reviewed.*

[Signature]
1/4/06

135809
Page 1

Serial No.: 09/833,119
Examiner: Fred O Ferris, III

Comments to Reasons for Allowance

The Notice of Allowability mischaracterized the teachings of the prior art and the interpretations of the claims. With respect to the interpretation of the claims and the word "case" as used in the claims, the Reasons for Allowance are objected to on the grounds that the invention is not limited to the embodiments disclosed, but is capable of numerous rearrangements, modifications and substitutions without departing from the spirit of the invention as set forth and defined by the claims, as stated at page 59, lines 23 through 30 of the specification.


With respect to the prior art teachings, the prior art does not disclose the steps as stated in paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Notice of Allowability. First, Chang reference nowhere describes designing an operable optical span. It only has defines models of a network system. It nowhere states that one of the steps is to design an operable optical span. Furthermore, it fails to describe performing a margin analysis on an operable optical to determine how much change said operable optical span can tolerate before said operable optical span becomes an inoperable optical span in one or more case types. As stated in the Office Action, the Chang reference does not disclose determining the margin of the optical span. Since there is no mention of optical span or determining a margin, there can be no disclosure or teaching that performing a margin analysis on said operable optical span to determine how much change said operable optical span can tolerate before said operable optical span becomes an inoperable optical span in one or more case types. In addition, the Frigo reference fails to disclose determining the margin of an optical span. It merely describes monitoring "the rate of signal degradation in the individual fibers of an optical communication network." The Frigo reference is describing an operating network. It is determining an operating system threshold for signal strengths transmitted to ONUs. It can not disclose determining acceptable margins to design changes of an optical span since the disclosed feeder fibers in the Frigo reference are already in operation and installed.

Serial No.: 09/833,119
Examiner: Fred O Ferris, III

For the above reasons, the claims are allowable over the prior art.

Respectfully submitted,

ALCATEL



Jessica W. Smith
Reg. No. 39,884

Dated: December 13, 2005

Alcatel USA
Intellectual Property Department
3400 W. Plano Parkway, M/S LEGL2
Plano, TX 75075
Phone: (972) 477-9109
Fax: (972) 477-9328